

REMARKS

Applicants submit this amendment in response to the Final Office Action dated September 9, 2006 and the Decision on Appeal dated June 30, 2011. Claims 1-47 and 50-88 are pending in the application. Claims 1-47 and 50-88 have been rejected. Claims 1, 3, 5, 40, 42, 50, 52, and 54 have been changed by this amendment. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 40, 42, 50, 52, and 54 in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the original or previous claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the original and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

The claims have been amended to clarify the claims and/or to expedite prosecution, and are fully supported by the specification. For example, amendments are supported throughout the specification, such as at least at Fig. 2, and page 1, line 18 to page 16. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-39 and 50-87 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection was reversed by the Board of Appeals.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-47 and 50-88 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jain et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,806,075 (“Jain”). Applicants respectfully traverse, and have amended the claims to clarify the invention and to expedite prosecution.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing convergence of multiple copies of a table to a same state in a database system, including, for each row of each table copy: associating and storing a timestamp in the table copy with the row, the timestamp indicating a time when a change to the row has occurred; associating and storing a copy identification in the table copy with the row, the copy identification being an identifier that uniquely identifies the table copy to which the row belongs; and associating and storing propagation controls in the table copy with the row, the propagation controls indicating whether a change to the row should be communicated to other table copies based at least in part on the timestamp of the change or the copy identification associated with the row. A change to a row of a given table copy is asynchronously captured from a database recovery log, the captured change is determined to be communicated to other table copies in accordance with the propagation controls, and the captured change is communicated and applied to the other table copies.

Jain does not disclose or suggest the recited method. For example, Jain does not disclose or suggest, for each row of each table copy, associating and storing a timestamp, a copy identification, and propagation controls in each table copy with each row, as recited in claim 1.

Jain discloses, in contrast, storing transaction information in separate tables that are used to replicate data modifications to other data sites, such as Jain’s separate tables of Figs. 8A and 8B. Jain does not store the recited information (timestamp, copy identification, propagation controls) in rows of the table copies that have the rows / data to be copied or changed.

Furthermore, Jain does not store propagation controls in each row of each table copy as recited in claim 1, where these propagation controls indicate whether a change to the row should be communicated to other table copies based on the copy identification and timestamp information in each table copy. Jain's separate tables record transaction information for particular transactions that have already been decided to be performed to modify data in data tables (e.g., Transactions Table, (col. 7, line 50), Transactions Nodes Table (col. 8, line 31), Calls Table (col. 8, line 49), Parameters Table (col. 9, line 42), and Exceptions Table (col. 10, lines 3-29)). Jain determines whether to perform a transaction by using a trigger based on a global variable or a user name (col. 13, lines 15-46), not based on propagation control information stored in table copy rows as recited in claim 1.

Applicants therefore believe that claim 1 is patentable over Jain.

Claims 2-39 are dependent from claim 1 and are patentable over Jain for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for additional reasons on their own merits. For example, some dependent claims recite further details regarding the recited information (timestamp, copy identification, and propagation controls) stored in the rows of each table copy which is not disclosed or suggested by Jain. In some examples, claims 11-14 further detail determining whether a change is to be communicated to other table copies using this information (copy identification, propagation controls); claims 15-18 recite sending this information (timestamp and copy identification) to other table copies to be stored therein; claims 20-23 recite detecting a conflict using this information (timestamp and copy identification) to detect a conflict; claims 25-28 recite determining a priority for a change using this information (timestamp and copy identification); claims 30-35 recite setting this information in table copies; claim 36 recites checking this information in table copies; and claims 38-39 recite reporting conflicting changes based on this information in table copies. Jain does not disclose or suggest these features based

on timestamp, copy identification, and/or propagation information stored in the rows of the table copies.

Independent claims 40 and 50 are system and computer readable medium claims, respectively, which recite features similar to those of claim 1 discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable over Jain for at least similar reasons as discussed above. Dependent claims 41-47 and 50-88 are dependent on claims 40 and 50 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as their parent claims, and for additional reasons on their own merits for reasons similar to corresponding dependent claims 2-39 explained above.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that claims 1-47 and 50-88 are patentable over Jain, and respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that claims 1-47 and 50-88 are allowable over the reference cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP P.C.

December 23, 2011

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728
(650) 493-4540 telephone
(650) 493-4549 fax